

Charting the Course to 2025:

Questionnaire Results

**York County Comprehensive Plan Review
Steering Committee**

November 15, 2004

What do you want York County to look like in 20 years?

Recommended changes?

■ Top Five

1. Limited/controlled growth
2. More green space
3. Maintain existing quality of life
4. Limited commercial/shopping centers
5. Improved transportation/traffic

What did they like most?

■ Top Five

1. Rural areas/atmosphere
2. Schools
3. Existing green areas
4. Convenient shopping/commercial services
5. Low crime/safe communities

What did they like least?

■ Top Five

1. Traffic (esp. Rt. 17)
2. Suburban sprawl (uncontrolled development)
3. Vacant buildings
4. Loss of trees/green space
5. Developer/commercial interests too powerful
5. Junk yards

What was attractive or unattractive?

- 12% - No comment
- Attractive
 - ◆ Residential areas
 - ◆ Banbury Cross, Skimino Landing, Kiln Creek, Running Man, Marlbank, Coventry, Settler's Crossing, Clairmont apartments, Lakes of Dare, Wythe Creek Farms, Grafton Woods

What was attractive or unattractive?

■ Attractive

- ◆ Kiln Creek businesses
- ◆ Yorktown
- ◆ Rt. 199 and Hampton Hwy plantings
- ◆ Tabb Library and YMCA
- ◆ Riverwalk

What was attractive or unattractive?

■ Unattractive

◆ Residential

- ◆ Houses with no trees

- ◆ York Terrace

- ◆ Mismatched houses along Dare, Big Bethel, and Seaford Roads

- ◆ Rt. 17 corridor

- ◆ General – all commercial areas (esp. strip malls)

What was attractive or unattractive?

■ Unattractive

- ◆ Vacant buildings
 - ◆ Gas stations
 - ◆ Dead shopping centers
 - Heritage Square, Winn Dixie
- ◆ Junkyards
- ◆ “Big Box” stores, Great Wolf Lodge
- ◆ Unkempt yards
- ◆ Rt. 17 trailer parks (convert to business)
- ◆ Presidents Park

What specifically was attractive or unattractive?

- 28% - No comment
- Attractive:
 - ◆ Landscaping, green areas, open space
 - ◆ Amenities (recreation facilities and walking/biking)
 - ◆ Design layout (spacious)
 - ◆ Well maintained
 - ◆ Close to where live
 - ◆ Buried utilities

What specifically was attractive or unattractive?

■ Unattractive:

- ◆ Vacancy of buildings
- ◆ Too high density residential
- ◆ No landscaping (esp. trees)
- ◆ Type of construction (cookie cutter)
- ◆ Small lot, big house
- ◆ Maintenance of houses and businesses
- ◆ Large parking lots (put in rear)
- ◆ Neon signage
- ◆ Low paying jobs
- ◆ More citizens, less commercial

What new services, programs, or facilities would they like to see?

- 25% - No comment
- Suggestions:
 1. Recreation facility (esp. upper County)
 2. Public transit (esp. seniors)
 3. More parks
 4. Support schools
 5. More water/sewer expansion
 6. More athletic/playing fields
 7. Sheriff's sub-stations

More suggestions for new services, programs, or facilities:

8. Land conservation (PDR)
9. Street lights
10. Bike lanes
11. Teen programs (Boys & Girls club)
12. County offices in upper County
13. Youth programs
14. Historical sites
15. Bury power lines
16. More recycling centers (recycle more items)
17. More Yorktown arts programs
18. Meals on Wheels program
19. Street cleaning
20. Light rail
21. Joint SPCA with JCC and Williamsburg
22. More police boats
23. Playgrounds
24. Golf courses
25. Support airport expansion
26. Beach front seafood market/shop

What services, programs, or facilities would they like discontinued?

- 62% - No comment
- 30% - No suggestions
- Suggestions:
 - ◆ No more water/sewer extension
 - ◆ Stop donating funds to CNU (esp. arts)
 - ◆ Cut out overseas trips
 - ◆ Outsource services:
 - ◆ Cost savings
 - ◆ Help private business grow

What recreational/cultural opportunities would they like to see?

- 29% - No comment
- Suggestions:
 - ◆ Local recreation facility
 - ◆ Upper county
 - ◆ Swimming, multiple indoor sports, exercise
 - ◆ YMCA
 - ◆ Support the Arts (esp. Theatre)
 - ◆ More athletic/playing fields

What recreational/cultural opportunities would they like to see?

■ Suggestions:

- ◆ More youth activities
- ◆ Teen facility and activities
- ◆ More parks
- ◆ Bike lanes
- ◆ More golf courses (affordable)
- ◆ Public transit
- ◆ Welcome Wagon program
- ◆ Cyber cafés
- ◆ Continue support JCC/Williamsburg recreation centers

What types of businesses should be encouraged?

- 35% - No comment
- 23% - No or adequate
- Suggestions to encourage:
 1. Restaurants (non-fast food)
 2. Upscale grocery store
 3. Technology/Clean business
 4. Sports/gambling complex
 5. Better shopping (other than Roses and Dollar General)

What types of businesses should be encouraged?

■ Other suggestions:

6. Home improvement
7. Furniture store
8. Factory outlet
9. Light manufacturing
10. Recreation
11. Camera/hobby stores
12. Pet shops
13. Marinas with food service
14. Retail with housing above
15. Sears
16. Mixed use cemetery/golf course

What types of businesses should be discouraged?

- Businesses mentioned by priority
 1. Gas station/convenience store
 2. Auto related
 - a. Junkyards
 - b. Car sales (used)
 - c. Car washes
 - d. Repair and parts
 3. Tattoo parlors
 4. Polluters (air, noise, odor, visual)
 5. Fast food restaurants
 6. Adult oriented

What types of businesses should be discouraged?

■ Businesses mentioned by priority

7. Timeshares, motels, hotels
8. Strip malls
9. Large retailers (Wal-Mart, Sam's, etc.)
10. No business east of Rt. 199 & Fenton Mill Road
11. Encourage infill to existing buildings
12. Bars and private clubs
13. Storage
14. Liquor stores
15. Contractor's storage
16. Grocery stores
17. Pawn shops
18. Batting cages
19. Flea markets

Should County purchase vacant/blighted lots to improve aesthetics?

- 10% - No comment
- 17% - No
 - ◆ Create incentives for private purchase
- 70% - Yes
 - ◆ Must have a plan that discusses:
 - ◆ Design, replacement use
 - ◆ Make green space or park
 - ◆ Only if affordable
 - ◆ Auto yards, gas stations, Rt. 17 mentioned most often

Should the 80,000 population cap be maintained?

- 10% - No comment
- <1% - Increase
 - ◆ 90,000 to 100,000
- 25% - Lower or reduce
 - ◆ 75,000
 - ◆ 62,300
- 48% - Maintain # at 80,000

Should the 80,000 population cap be maintained?

- Increase, because,
 - ◆ Can't encroach on property rights
- Lower because,
 - ◆ Less stress on infrastructure
 - ◆ Road network cited 80% of time
 - ◆ Keep rural nature
- Maintain # at 80,000 because,
 - ◆ Infrastructure already inadequate
 - ◆ Preserve historic nature

Should land be available for apartments or townhouses?

- 10% - No comment
- 55% - No, reasons:
 - ◆ Plenty already
 - ◆ Increase traffic and school children
 - ◆ Take tax dollars to support
- 28% - Yes, reasons:
 - ◆ Limited retirement or townhomes
 - ◆ Good for low income, elderly
 - ◆ Price to attract middle income earners

Should County encourage moderately priced housing?

- 16% - No comment
- 30% - No, reasons:
 - ◆ Already enough
 - ◆ Stay out of social issues
 - ◆ Let market decide
 - ◆ Low income brings crime
- 46% - Yes, reasons
 - ◆ Want to live in County all life
 - ◆ Encourage new home buyers
 - ◆ Encourage step up to bigger better house

Should County encourage moderately priced housing?

- Stipulations for creating moderately priced housing:
 - ◆ Good construction quality
 - ◆ Near shopping areas
 - ◆ Fit with existing developments
 - ◆ Single-family detached dwellings

Did they believe mixed use or neo-traditional development should be encouraged?

- 17% - No comment
- 32% - No, reasons:
 - ◆ Keep rural living
 - ◆ Too much traffic
 - ◆ Too much population
- 38% - Yes, reasons:
 - ◆ Human scale – gets density, doesn't compromise quality of life
 - ◆ Appealing

Did they believe mixed use or neo-traditional development should be encouraged?

- Areas to put it
 - ◆ Tabb area
 - ◆ Not in Tabb area
 - ◆ Upper County
 - ◆ Not in upper County
 - ◆ Adjacent to Williamsburg
 - ◆ Along Rt. 17 corridor
 - ◆ Near historic Yorktown

Should County encourage housing for seniors?

- 26% - No comment
- 16% - No more senior housing
 - ◆ What will happen when housing is not needed anymore
 - ◆ Increases population and traffic
- 52% - Yes
 - ◆ Near hospital and retail
 - ◆ Need public transit
 - ◆ Affordability

Did they think County's roads were adequate? New roads?

- 41% of comments dealing with Rt. 17
 - ◆ Widening
 - ◆ Creating parallel by-pass
 - ◆ Intersection improvements
- Other suggestions:
 - ◆ Equal comments for a Ft. Eustis connector to Seaford and vice versa
 - ◆ Reduce development (will reduce traffic)
 - ◆ Create another route to Gloucester
 - ◆ Improve bikeways

Should County do more to mitigate storm events?

- 32% - No comment
- Suggestions included:
 - ◆ Overall County does great job
 - ◆ Continue working on storm water runoff and cleaning ditches
 - ◆ Bury power and other lines
 - ◆ Improve education & communication efforts

Should the County purchase land to preserve open space?

- 28% - No comment
- >1% - Said no
- <70% - Said yes
- Suggestions included:
 - ◆ Purchase for recreational purposes only
 - ◆ Purchase to protect wildlife and environmental areas
 - ◆ Make open space part of new growth and development plans

Are there historic resources that should be protected?

- 40% - No comment
- 30% - Said no, unsure, or didn't know
- Suggestions included:
 - ◆ Upper York County
 - ◆ Union Town/Slab Town
 - ◆ More promotion of Yorktown
 - ◆ Many areas in Grafton
 - ◆ Historic black neighborhoods
 - ◆ National Park areas
 - ◆ Waterfront

General Comments

- Very few general comments
- Measure available retail space before allowing new retail buildings
- Increase cigarette tax to pay for schools and playing fields
- Contact military about obtaining land from bases
- Improve removal of dead animals
- Implement Comprehensive Plan's Vision into real world
- Be careful in management and leasing of Riverwalk to make it a success.